

Appl. No. 10/691,577  
Amendment dated: November 3, 2005  
Reply to OA of: May 4, 2005

### **REMARKS**

Applicants note with appreciation that indication in the outstanding Official Action that claims 5-7, 13 and 15 as claiming allowable subject matter that would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Applicants have amended the claims to add new claims 22-26. New independent claim represents the incorporation of allowable claim 5 into base claim 4, and thus Applicants respectfully assert that new independent claim 22 is clearly patentable as indicated in the outstanding Official Action. Claims 23-26 represent dependent claims 6, 7, 13 and 15, respectively, rewritten to depend from allowable claim 22.

Applicants have also amended the specification and the drawings in order to address the objections to the drawings contained in the outstanding Official Action.

The Official Action urges that the drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) because the drawings do not show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, the Official Action identifies the "pixel-defining layer" of claim 10, the "plurality of conductive lines" of claim 4 and the "multilayer structure" of claim 21 as the features of the claims which are not shown in the drawings.

First, with respect to the "pixel-defining layer" of claim 10, Applicants have amended the specification so that first full paragraph on page 5 of the specification, which describes Figures 2 and 3 in detail, explains that the "pixel defining layer" is illustrated by element 140 in Figures 2 and 3. Support for this amendment to the specification can be found at, e.g., page 7, lines 6 through 9, wherein it is explained that the pixel defining layer is formed on the first electrodes. This description is consistent with the placement of element 140 in Figures 2 and 3. Therefore, in light of the amendment to the specification, Applicants respectfully assert that this feature of the claims is shown in the drawings.

Next, with respect to the “plurality of conductive lines” of claim 4, Applicants respectfully assert that because conductive lines are widely used in the structure of organic electroluminescent panel, one skilled in the art would easily understand where conductive lines would be placed in the structure of the organic electroluminescent panels. Conductive lines connect the driver IC(s) and the first electrodes or the second electrodes of an organic electroluminescent pane. Applicants assert that it would unfairly burdensome to have to show every conductive line and the IC’s they connect in the drawings of the present application. Additionally, Applicants note that the specification, at page 5, line 19, clearly describes where the conductive lines would be located if shown included in the drawings. Specifically, the specification explains that “[t]he plural conducting lines (not shown) containing the silver alloy connect to the first electrodes 130 or the second electrodes 170.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully assert that the objection to the drawings with respect to the “multilayer structure” of claim 21 should be withdrawn for similar reasons as those given above with respect to the “plurality of conducting lines” of claim 4. That is, Applicants respectfully assert that a multilayer structure of organic electroluminescent medium is well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art and therefore does not need to be illustrated in the drawings. In order to improve the light emitting performance of the organic electroluminescent medium, the organic electroluminescent medium is preferably sub-categorized into at least three layers, e.g., an electron transmitting layer, an organic electroluminescent layer, and a hole transmitting layer. Each of layer has its own and unique function, such as transmitting the electrons or the holes effectively and prolonging the life time of the electrons or the holes. In certain cases, to further improve the performance of the organic electroluminescent medium, the organic electroluminescent medium can be further sub-categorized into five, or even seven layers. Since the multilayer structure of the organic electroluminescent medium is well-known and widely used in the

Appl. No. 10/691,577  
Amendment dated: November 3, 2005  
Reply to OA of: May 4, 2005

industry, Applicants assert that it is unnecessary to illustrate this feature in the drawings of the present application. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

With respect to the objection to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5), Applicants respectfully assert that this objection should be withdrawn in light of the amendments to the specification and the drawings. First, as explained above, the specification has been amended to now include reference to element 140. With respect to element 142 of Figure 2, Applicants have submitted herewith a corrected drawing sheet which deletes the reference numeral 142. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

With respect to the objection to claim 7 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claims, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn in light of the amendment to claim 5. Specifically, Applicants have amended claim 5 to recite "a silver alloy" in place of "the silver alloy." In doing so, Applicants assert that claim 5 now recites a silver alloy for the plurality of auxiliary electrodes that is separate from the silver alloy referred to in claim 4 (which is with respect to the plurality of conducting lines). In light of this amendment to claim 5, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 7 further limits the subject matter of the claim from which it depends by specifying that the auxiliary electrode silver alloy has a specific composition. The specific composition for the silver alloy recited in claim 4 is with respect to the conductive lines, while the specific composition of the silver alloy recited in claim 7 is with respect to the auxiliary electrodes. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

The provisional rejection of claims 1-3 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2-4 of co-pending Application No. 10/743,876 has been carefully considered but is most respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit herewith a copy of the Notice of Abandonment for

Appl. No. 10/691,577  
Amendment dated: November 3, 2005  
Reply to OA of: May 4, 2005

Application No. 10/743,876 that was filed by Examiner Nadav on September 19, 2005. Because Application No. 10/743,876 is no longer pending in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Applicants respectfully assert that a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection of the present claims over abandoned Application No. 10/743,876 is improper and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The provisional rejection of claims 4, 8-12, 14 and 16-21 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of co-pending Application No. 10/743,876 in view of Sakemura has been carefully considered but is most respectfully traversed.


Applicants submit herewith a copy of the Notice of Abandonment for Application No. 10/743,876 that was filed by Examiner Nadav on September 19, 2005. Because Application No. 10/743,876 is no longer pending in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Applicants respectfully assert that a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection of the present claims over abandoned Application No. 10/743,876 is improper. Further, Sakemura standing alone clearly fails to disclose or suggest every element of the present claims and therefore cannot support a §102 or §103 rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/691,577  
Amendment dated: November 3, 2005  
Reply to OA of: May 4, 2005

In view of the above comments and further amendments to the claims, favorable reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims now present in the application are most respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

By:   
Richard E. Fichter  
Registration No. 26,382

625 Slaters Lane, 4<sup>th</sup> Fl.  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Phone: (703) 683-0500  
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

REF:SAB:cmd  
A01.wpd

November 3, 2005